

# **SCAAC Meeting Minutes**

***(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)***

July 6, 1998  
State Board Room

## **SCAAC Agenda**

<b>#</b>	<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Presenters</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting Minutes</b>	<b>Anne Keene</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>External Communication Guidelines</b>	<b>Robyn Oatley</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Request for Proposal Process for Testing</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Consistent Administration of Assessment</b>	<b>Robyn Oatley</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Accountability Issues</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>School Rewards</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Other School Rewards</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Drop Out Rate and Rewards</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Highly Skilled Educators</b>	<b>Bob Lumsden</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Council Business</b>	<b>Anne Keene</b>
<b>Adjournment</b>		

## 1. Meeting Minutes

Anne Keene

The School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council was called to order by Chairperson Anne Keene at 9:08 AM. Jon Frederick called the roll. The following Council members were present constituting a quorum plus two over the required nine:

Jon Akers  
Suzanne Guyer  
Maxie Johnson  
Anne Keene

Benny Lile  
Gary Mielcarek  
Bob Sexton  
Linda Sheffield

Sharon Solomon  
John Stephens  
Maynard Thomas

Chairperson Anne Keene outlined the Council's working agenda for the day and announced lunch at 12:30 and dinner at 6:00 p.m. The Council planned a full day including work after dinner.

## 2. External Communication Guidelines

Robyn Oatley

As a first consideration, Anne Keene introduced the topic of the need for the Council to establish a communications policy plan to meet the growing concerns of all parties who have expressed a desire to either address the group or present position papers and other advice; therefore, it seemed necessary for the Council to establish guidelines so that the work during the sessions could move forward while dealing with external communication. Robyn Oatley of Kentucky Department of Education Communications staff presented a draft plan of how the Council might proceed in an efficient manner.

The key questions were:

1. How to deal with those wishing to speak at Council meetings.
2. How to accept and process written statements on issues from various groups.
3. How the Council can best utilize time and whether time limits need to be enforced for any and all kinds of communication.
4. Whether a written document would be more acceptable than actually scheduling short periods of time for speakers to address the Council.
5. What limitations or deadlines might be necessary regarding how far in advance the Council would require speakers to register or provide written documents for consideration.

### SCAAC Comments:

Bob Sexton suggested the Council follow a similar process used by Kentucky Board of Education whereby contributors register in advance or submit written documents in advance for Council to review.

Sharon Solomon suggested that time limits would seem practical and necessary.

Bob Sexton raised the basic question of whether or not the Council actually had or

would have the time to deal with such written or oral presentations during its regular sessions.

Gary Mielcarek favors a written document as more desirable due to the difficulty of limiting speakers and enforcing the limits set; in short, time is a key problem.

Anne Keene expressed the need to respect the concerns of all interested parties and afford some way for those concerns to be heard.

Anne then asked Robyn Oatley to highlight some of the concepts in her draft plan for communications. Robyn shared the draft document and asked for suggestions, additions, or revisions. A couple of her suggestions included scheduling some regional meeting around the state which could serve as an open forum for speakers and using 3 x 5 index cards during meetings or at the regional meetings, so that interested parties could submit their questions and advice.

Suzanne Guyer expressed approval for Robyn's ideas and voiced her concern that there not be a negative perception of the Council's working sessions--that substantive discussions occur and that the Council is not being driven entirely by Kentucky Department of Education/Kentucky Board of Education in its deliberations.

Bob Sexton questioned whether or not the selection process was not designed to assure that all the factions were represented by the Governor's appointees; he asked if the Council members spoke for the groups they represented and if they brought the organizations' concerns and positions on the issues to the table or if these representatives merely speak for themselves individually.

Anne Keene stated that Council members may not be representing the positions of their organizations except in the broadest sense; she felt that the purpose of the representation is to elicit the best thinking from a wide variety of groups and individuals.

Jon Akers understood that he was recruited to represent school administrators and undertook the role with this Council to voice the concerns and positions from that group; he has sought out school administrators in order to get their opinions so that he could voice them during the Council's deliberations.

Anne Keene reiterated her position that the Council afford as much time to those wishing to communicate with the Council to the extent feasible and practical given the time constraints.

Dr. Cody agreed with Anne's statement and expressed his opinion that while Governor Patton did select representatives from as many organizations as possible, that did not mean that Council members could always speak for an entire group or organization. It is expected that each Council member will continue to shape their individual ideas as issues are discussed in Council sessions.

John Stephens expressed his conviction that everyone on the Council was selected to focus on what's best for the students.

Maynard Thomas suggested that Council should make themselves available to the field and maintain a high profile.

Gary Mielcarek commented that while the Council needed to have a mechanism for input from various groups, the Council cannot get bogged down in the process. He suggested written communications with questions, positions, and responses to the Council's work would be the best choice. Maynard Thomas agreed that the written communication idea seemed feasible with a deadline for receipt, so that Council members could review the material prior to meeting days.

Anne Keene asked if there would need to be some provision for oral presentations?

SCAAC Questions:

Anne Keene added that Council members were most certainly seeking input from their organizations.

Chairperson Anne Keene asked Robyn Oatley to revise her draft communication plan so the Council could review it again in the decision making process.

Linda Sheffield asked if there were a rough estimate of the number of speakers who might want to appear before the Council. The answer was that there could be many.

Chair asked the Council to review the draft of Robyn Oatley's communication plan. Jon Akers raised a point of clarification on the language as to whether or not the Council would invite speakers to address the Council based on a written request or position paper. Discussion followed and the Council reviewed the draft document. Robyn Oatley was asked to revise the plan as directed and submit a final draft for approval.

SCAAC Motion:

John Stephens moved that the Council approve the intent of the communication plan with the specific provision that the Council would approve a final draft of an official communication plan. Bob Sexton seconded the motion and the motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

Pursuant to the motion, Sharon Solomon asked if only organizations could submit positions, questions, comment or if individuals can also do the same. It was decided that individuals would also have the same recourse to communicate with the Council.

### **3. Request for Proposal Process for Testing**

**Scott Trimble**

Scott informed the Council that the Request For Proposal was put out on June 19 and that Kentucky Board of Education had received advice from all sources named by statute. He also said that copies of the RFP could be furnished for Council member if any were interested. Scott also summarized the basic format of the RFP. All proposals from contractors will be evaluated and negotiated during the process.

Chairperson asked for clarification on one bullet from the summary document on Kentucky Board of Education's decisions on Request For Proposal. The question focused on single or multiple test forms. In reply, Jonathan Dings answered that these are issues that will be decided over time. Bob Sexton expressed his concern that the term CATS not be confused as the name of the actual assessment; CATS is the term the legislators wrote into House Bill 53 which refers to the entire assessment and accountability system replacing KIRIS. Bob felt that the Council should do all that is possible to clear up any confusion on this matter. Scott Trimble noted that the RFP does not call for a contractor to name the assessment itself. Deputy Commissioner Gene Wilhoit noted that Kentucky Department of Education is concerned and aware of the problem of naming the assessment.

Anne Keene shared with the Council Kentucky Board of Education Chairperson Helen Mountjoy's compliments on the dedicated and hard work of the Council.

### **4. Consistent Administration of Assessment**

**Robyn Oatley**

The next item of the agenda was revisiting the issues of consistent administration of the assessment at the high school level. Basically, the EAARS (Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee) requested that the Council revisit these issues just to be sure that all considerations have been carefully weighed; the intent of this request was not to ask the Council to reverse its decision, but, rather to revisit the issue for a final and thorough consideration.

Robyn Oatley summarized the report on the responses to these issues from the field. Robyn handed out a written report and noted that her office had received 1,067 responses in one month. She also shared that 42,000 educators received a mailing outlining assessment issues previously discussed by the Council, as well as, other information. Robyn announced that information and updates can be found on the Kentucky Department of Education website. She also announced plans to conduct some regional hearings so that interested parties across the state could attend and both receive information and offer feedback on the issues. On July 21, there will be hearing at the Morehead University Center in Prestonsburg at 10:00 AM. In the report Robyn presented, a majority of the high school responses did not want senior testing in April or May; otherwise, there was a fairly even split on the spring/fall testing dates. (For reference the Council can refer to the document "Summary of All Feedback to Date.")

SCAAC Question:

Jon Akers asked if respondents brought up block scheduling?

KDE Response:

Robyn Oatley and Gene Wilhoit both answered that yes, that issue was mentioned and that it seems that block is now the norm with approximately 50% of the high schools being on some kind of block schedule, and that many other high schools indicated they were seriously considering going to a block schedule.

Robyn continued to guide the Council through the "Feedback" document.

SCAAC Question:

Anne Keene asked if students were included in any of the feedback.

KDE Response:

Robyn said that to date none had been included, and she asked for ideas and guidance in how to accomplish it. Some of the responses including canvassing students in various summer programs such as the Governor's Scholars, Governor's School for the Arts, various academic camps (TIP—Talent Identification Program operated jointly with Duke University), and band camps.

SCAAC Question:

Bob Sexton focused attention on the priority of a timeline. What decisions must be made that are critical? He asked two basic questions: what will the Council do with the issue of student accountability and should the same accountability system apply for all grade levels? When do these decisions have to be made in order to comply with the provisions of House Bill 53?

KDE Response:

Gene Wilhoit noted that Bob's questions are indeed critical questions and that vendors would need to be given some direction on these matters. Scott Trimble noted that vendors need any proposals by August 1st or that options could be left open for consideration.

SCAAC Question:

Anne Keene asked if decisions made now were for the next two years, or if the decisions would go beyond 2002?

KDE Response:

Scott advised that contractors needed direction about what 1999-2000 needs to do or accomplish.

SCAAC Question:

Anne replied by asking if the Council needed to hold to the current plan since an assessment can't be ready for this fall?

SCAAC Answer:

Both Scott and Jonathan agreed that an assessment could not be ready for fall.

**5. Accountability Issues**

**Scott Trimble**

Bob Sexton addressed the Council on the purpose and definition of "accountability" given the background and history of Kentucky's accountability model and KERA basic assumptions about accountability concepts. The original concept dealt with the leverage accountability offers and the second concept dealt with motivation issues—incentives which recognize high quality work; monetary rewards for excellent work which would make teaching a more desirable profession and schools good place to work.

House Bill 53 mandates system and school accountability and at student accountability to the extent such accountability is valid and reliable.

One of the major problems in recruiting teachers to teach in the grades that were the accountability grades; generally there was a sort of "free ride" mentally that if a teacher avoided the accountability grades as assignments then they might be less responsible for the assessment and the results. Motivation for teachers as well as students became and remains an issue.

SCAAC Question:

Maynard Thomas asked: is there any truth to the rumor that KIRIS was designed to have schools fail; the question goes to whether or not such statements or perceptions are accurate

KDE Response:

No, the system did not have a built in design for which anticipated failure. Slow, continuous progress, however, would a rule that would allow schools to improve over time. The problem that emerged was that some schools had very sharp levels of improvement in some cases and this made maintaining a high performance problematic.

Scott Trimble commented that the initial theory was essentially that all students can learn and all schools could grow at steady rates. Scott agreed with Anne that schools who worked hard and made dramatically high gains would have difficulty in continuing growth at high levels. The system was never designed to build in failure.

Anne Keene commented that in any design there are both intended and unintended outcomes; KIRIS was not exception to this rule of thumb. The Council must look at the important decisions surrounding an accountability model, including a good, clear, working definition for accountability.

Scott Trimble elaborated on his previous statement by reiterating that the system was designed to see all schools achieve growth not sanctions. The system reward progress

no matter where the school might have started on the scale/index. At his point Chairperson Anne Keene said that the law charges the Council with "simplifying" the accountability system.

Sue Rigney addressed the issue of standards based performance and outlines the philosophy behind the novice to distinguished levels; she said the state believes that given good instruction students should be able to attain the proficient standards. High standards coupled with a belief that over time students can achieve proficiency is the basis for the philosophy that "all students can learn at high levels."

Jonathan Dings focused the Council's attention on how to use the years from 1999 to 2000 for accountability; he cautioned looking too far into the future at this point in the deliberations.

SCAAC Question:

When John Stephens asked whether the Council needed to consider special education students in this accountability design.

KDE Response:

Sue Rigney answered that that was not negotiable since the law still includes "ALL" students; the issue is what method of inclusion the Council will recommend.

SCAAC Discussion/Questions:

Linda Sheffield asked about the "straight line model." She asked if there were some level at which and beyond which the state would "leave schools alone?" She expressed her desire to see some weighting the standards and not lowering them. She gave the example of novice level receiving a zero value in the past and that perhaps the Council would need to discuss some changes in how the four score points are weighted from novice to distinguished.

Jon Akers also asked if there were a certain level in the score range that would be the acceptable; are there minimums? Maynard Thomas mentioned that in some rural or small schools there were no choices for parents to send their students to another more successful school district—to high performing schools. He said there were either minimal choices or no choices. Sharon Solomon said that her work demonstrates that parents who call in to the Fact Line of the Jefferson County Schools asked for schools with high standards or how schools in their districts ranked in comparison with other schools in the area or district. John Stephens recalled that even when the state used CTBS schools were ranked statewide from 1-175 and that this desire to compare was not a new one and would probably remain.

Jon Akers clarified his question by asking if the Council wants to set a standard which states that schools are successful once they reach that level or standard; his experience is that parents, businesses, and communities want to know what constitutes a successful school. Bob Sexton commented that that's what accountability is all about.



Maynard Thomas followed up his previous comment on equity among schools, stating that technology is quite advanced in some districts while it is non-existent or minimal in other districts.

*KDE Response:*

Sue Rigney commented on the inclusive nature of accountability in Kentucky. In Kentucky "all means all" and this has been a distinguishing characteristic of accountability in the state.

The Council next considered some of the parameters in defining accountability: high standards, equity (equal accessibility to all the tools of education), "all means all," and continuous progress or growth.

---

Council Recessed for an afternoon break at 3:05 PM. Council reconvened after the break at 3:35 PM. Ten Council members were present.

---

## **6. School Rewards**

**Scott Trimble**

The Council began its discussions on incentives necessary and appropriate for schools to reach desired progress.

John Stephens asked if the Council needed to look at problems with rewards from the past. Specifically, he mentioned the debate over sharing rewards with other personnel besides certified personnel. Bob Sexton suggested that the same kinds of questions on what rewards would be given and how they were applied would also be considerations for any discussion on sanctions. Bob asked if it was a given in House Bill 53 that rewards would be awarded in 1998-2000? Is the law clear on this point; furthermore, will the Council specify or recommend dollar amounts? In answer to Bob's questions, Bonnie Brinly who was present at the meeting said that the law did not preclude rewards other than dollar amounts.

Suzanne Guyer addressed the issue of whether money is the one thing that provides incentives to teachers? Her opinion was that financial rewards weren't the major incentive for improvement or growth. Suzanne pointed out that there had been problems with using money as the rewards as schools were often divided about who should be included in the rewards.

Bob Sexton asked if the Council had the option of listing or naming some alternative ways that financial rewards could be used instead of just giving it directly as salary or monetary bonuses?

Maxie Johnson said that she would rather see the money go to some identified area of need, not just to staff. She noted as other had that the money had caused bickering and bitterness in many schools.

Anne Keene shared findings from her past research on the rewards and sanctions under the previous accountability model. Basically, her research revealed that the majority of teachers in her survey feared sanctions more than they sought salary bonuses. That seemed to be the primary motivational force.

Linda Sheffield felt that a good option would be to set up a committee to determine the use of the money toward a school improvement project.

Bob Sexton asked if the language of the law prohibited the use of money for compensation.

The Council can make recommendations for the use of reward money for school purpose, as well as, other kinds of rewards.

**SCAAC Motion:**

Chairperson Anne Keene called for a motion regarding the use of rewards for 1996-2000. General discussion followed on the intent of House Bill 53 as it concerns use of funds and or rewards for educational purposes.

Bob Sexton moved that the Council recommend that rewards be used for school purposes to be determined by the School Based Decision Making or if none exist then the school's principal for the period of 1996-2000. The motion was seconded by John Stephens.

**SCAAC Discussion on Motion:**

Maxie Johnson ask does the Council need to specifically exclude the use of rewards for teacher bonuses?

Anne Keene commented that the Council should stick to the language of the law. The law provides for a formula based on the number of certified staff.

Linda Sheffield ask what does this mean that there will only be one level of reward? For example, a school with twenty teachers would receive twice the amount of rewards as a school with only ten teachers.

Bob Sexton ask what it means is that there is a broad range of options that could be determined by the SBDM.

**KDE Response:**

Sue Rigney clarified the exact language of House Bill 53 referencing the law itself and led the Council through the law section by section. Scott Trimble corrected an error on

the recommendation matrix which mentioned "one level of reward." Scott said that language should be deleted.

SCAAC Motion:

Question was called and the motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

## **7. Other School Rewards**

**Scott Trimble**

Other rewards other than monetary rewards. The Council brainstormed some possibilities which included the following:

- Flags of recognition
- Some way to acknowledge achievement toward standards
- recognition programs
- news/media releases
- professional development opportunities
- various kinds of citations

Chairperson Anne Keene suggested that the Council might benefit from a review of information from other states dealing with accountability and rewards models or systems.

John Stephens ask the Council if they should now consider the issues concerning those schools who will require assistance. Jon Akers suggested that the Council needed to look to the field—principals and teachers—to ask for input on what would provide incentives as far as rewards go. Anne Keene suggested a plan to accomplish this kind of input.

Jon Akers suggested that a communication go out through Robyn Oatley's office requesting input and suggestions from the field. With this suggestion, Anne Keene asked Robyn to plan and to report back a plan for soliciting input on the incentives, non-monetary reward issues. Robyn agreed to work on this project with the Council.

Deputy Commissioner Gene Wilhoit announced that Carolyn Kelly (University of Wisconsin—Madison) will be in Kentucky and the Council could possibly meet with her for some advice on the rewards/incentives issues. Carolyn Kelly is a nationally recognized expert in this area. The dates of her visit are from July 20-22nd. Benny Lile and Bob Sexton volunteered to be available for a meeting and the specifics will be worked out later; other Council members who volunteered were Gary Mielcarek and Sharon Solomon.

## 8. Drop Out Rate and Rewards

Scott Trimble

### SCAAC Discussion:

The council focused on the 8% dropout rate as the limit for any school eligible for rewards under the provisions of House Bill 53. Gene Wilhoit reported that the way dropout information is collected and reported is under redesign and that most of this data collection will be handled within Kentucky Department of Education rather than by an external contractor.

Dr. Cody explained current dropout policy and data collection methods. It is opinion that the Council need not get too involved with the definition of what constitutes a dropout; furthermore, he explained that 8% is the cut off factor under the law and schools exceeding that percentage cannot be eligible for rewards. He further explained that there were schools in Kentucky with high dropout rates but which have high success rates. The Council might recommend whether or nor to weight that rate in some way; the 8% is not a continued issue beyond the year 2000.

### SCAAC Questions:

Maynard Thomas asked if students in alternative schools counted as dropouts? Gene Wilhoit explained that these students are not designated as dropouts and that they tracked back to whatever school they would normally have attended. Students are not counted as dropouts if they are enrolled in any other secondary school in Kentucky or in another state. The school is responsible for tracking the status of dropouts. Also, students in home schooling situations and students who die are not figured in the dropout category. If positive testimony can be given by an adult or someone over the age of fourteen that a student is enrolled elsewhere in school then that constitutes proof that the student is not a dropout. This is current policy. The current average statewide yearly dropout rate is 5.5%.

### SCAAC Motion:

After discussion Bob Sexton moved that for calculating for rewards, a school must have a dropout rate of 6% or lower for the years 1998-2002 and beyond. The motion was seconded by Maynard Thomas. The following summarizes discussion on the issue of maximum dropout rate allowed for rewards consideration.

### SCAAC Discussion/Questions:

Linda Sheffield stated that a reduction by 2% in that period of time seemed stringent. Jonathan Dings asked if the Council wanted to include this in considerations on qualifying schools for eligibility in reducing paperwork as mandated in House Bill 53?

Benny Lile asked for clarification on the wording of the motion whether the language should be schools or districts? The language of House Bill 53 doesn't exclude any school whether it is a primary, middle, or high school.

As part of this discussion Jonathan Dings reminded the Council that there is a year's lag in information or data and that this may be a consideration the Council would need to make.

Discussion followed on the 6% dropout rate. The questions was called.

**SCAAC Motion:**

Bob Sexton's motions passed by a vote of 9 to 2. Following this vote the Chair called recess for dinner break at 6:05 PM. The Council was informed that after the dinner break David Allen, Bob Lumsden and Gordon Newton would present their position of the Distinguished Educators/Highly Skilled Educators issues in House Bill 53.

---

Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the Council at 7:00 PM; the following Council members were present establishing a quorum:

Linda Sheffield, Maxie Johnson, Gary Mielcarek, Suzanne Guyer, Sharon Solomon, Bob Sexton, John Stephens, Maynard Thomas, Benny Lile, Anne Keene

---

## **9. Highly Skilled Educators**

**Bob Lumsden**

The Chair introduced David Allen, Bob Lumsden and Gordon Newton to present the history of the Distinguished Educator program and issues dealing with the Highly Skilled Educator program which will replace the Distinguished Educators program pursuant to House Bill 53. David Allen gave a brief overview and history of the program's purpose which is to provide assistance in improving teaching and learning. Originally, the DE's were to be assigned at a 1:1 ratio and assist schools by modeling effective instructional practices. Over time the DE's were stretched too thinly and the ratio rose to 1:5 and the goal of modeling effective teaching practices became impractical or impossible. During the first biennium of the program 100% of the assisted schools improved their performance on KIRIS assessment and many schools moved directly into rewards.

At this point David Allen introduced a five column matrix with columns giving the language of House Bill 53, Kentucky Revised Statute Prior to April 1998, Questions, Lessons Learned, and Policy Options. Each Council member was given a copy of the document. David Allen, Bob Lumsden, and Gordon Newton led the Council through each segment and all the information provided in each section of the matrix. Each bullet was discussed and examples of lessons learned and policy options were presented.

**SCAAC Discussion/Questions:**

Bob Sexton asked for a timeline for when the recommendations on these issues needed to be completed. Generally, something would need to be in place and ready to go as an assistance program by the time scores are reported.

Anne Keene commented that that Kentucky Board of Education has expressed a desire to move quickly on these issues so that a program will be ready to implement.

In a related matter, Benny Lile questioned the scope of the scholastic audit referenced in the matrix and in House Bill 53.

Bob Lumsden answered that the issue went more to the need to build capacity within the school so that school personnel could continue without a high degree of assistance, in essence a self-perpetuating model of capacity building in instruction and leadership within the school.

Bob Sexton asked what had been the biggest problem for the legislators with the former Distinguished Educators Program and also asked how those concerns had been addressed?

Bob Lumsden felt that essentially the problem became one of inadequate numbers of DE's and that schools became disgruntled. In some cases, the DE's became more directive and less collaborative as the number of schools one DE served increased. There was general agreement that the DE program was stretched beyond its capacity and scope as the need for local school assistance increased. Bob Lumsden added that the staff evaluations every six months was also a very stressful factor.

John Stephens commented that in his district there was some consulting by principals who had had DE's where the DE was seen as a threat and this created in some cases a negative attitude. John suggested that in the future the assistance be perceived as less punitive and more as less threatening assistance.

The discussion shifted to how many schools the new Highly Skilled Educators might have to serve. Linda Sheffield asked if one Highly Skilled Educators might be assigned two schools? David Allen's response was that while that was a possibility, it was not the ideal especially if the school served were a large school.

Anne Keene asked for an overview of the selection and training of DE's. David Allen outlined the entire process in detail for the Council. Anne then asked for what would be defined as a year insofar as the Highly Skilled Educators would be concerned. David Allen's response was that Highly Skilled Educators would operate under Memorandum of Agreement which run for a fiscal year July 1-June 30. Assignments would be determined after scores are released. Typically, a Highly Skilled Educators would then remain with the assigned school until the June 30th date. After that time, a determination could be made by a scholastic audit and service to the school could continue with either the Highly Skilled Educators assigned or a new Highly Skilled Educators.

Benny Lile asked what involvement the Regional Service Centers (RSC) would have in this assistance program. Bob Lumsden answered that RSC would be serving all schools in their respective regions who need assistance, not just those schools in decline or eligible for Highly Skilled Educators support. The goal would be to work in a collaborative manner.

Suzanne Guyer asked if the one year term was a term for the school or also the length of employment for the Highly Skilled Educators? David Allen answered that the term

was for one year for the Highly Skilled Educators on Memorandum of Agreement but that the terms are renewable on a year to year basis.

Anne Keene asked for clarification on the purpose of the scholastic audit. Gordon Newton responded that the purpose was to determine what kind of help needed and what schools required assistance. Another determination of the scholastic audit is to assess the appropriateness of a school designation as a reward or decline school. If decline is the appropriate designation then the assistance plan would be made to make progress. A scholastic audit can also be used to advise on best practices and teaching strategies.

The point was clarified that the scholastic audit is a process that precedes the Highly Skilled Educators assignment.

There was general discussion and reference to the provisions in House Bill 53 dealing with the issues being discussed. It was noted that during the interim period before a new accountability model would be designed there can be no staff evaluations.

The Council was asked to review the matrix five column document and consider the options.

## **10. Council Business**

**Anne Keene**

Bob Sexton suggested that for future meeting and productivity the Council might consider forming focus groups or subcommittees which might break the routine of long meeting days. The subcommittees could then brainstorm ideas and make a recommendation for the full Council to discuss.

## **Adjournment**

### SCAAC Motion:

Benny Lile moved the Council adjourn; the motion was seconded by John Stephens and approved by those present; the Council adjourned.